

ADDITIVE PRESERVING RANK ONE MAPS ON HILBERT C^* -MODULES

BIN MENG

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we characterize a class of additive maps on Hilbert C^* -modules which maps a "rank one" adjointable operators to another rank one operators.

1. INTRODUCTION AND PRELIMINARIES

The problem of determining linear maps Φ on $\mathbf{B}(X)$ preserving certain properties has attracted attention of many mathematicians in recent decades. They have been devoted to the study of linear maps preserving spectrum, rank, nilpotency, etc.

Rank preserving problem is a basic problem in the study of linear preserver problem. Rank preserving linear maps have been studied intensively by Hou in [2]. In [4, 9] the authors used very elegant arguments to completely describe additive mappings preserving (or decreasing) rank one.

In our study of free probability theory, we find that module maps on Hilbert C^* -module preserving certain properties are also important [6, 7], and thus the study of the modules preserving problem becomes attractive. In [8], a complete description of modules maps which preserving rank one modular operators is given. Naturally in the present paper we consider additive maps on modules preserving rank one, which much more complicated than the module maps case.

A Hilbert C^* -module over a C^* -algebra $\mathcal{A}$ is a left $\mathcal{A}$ -module $\mathcal{M}$ equipped with an $\mathcal{A}$ -valued inner product $\langle, \rangle$ which is $\mathcal{A}$ -linear in the first and conjugate $\mathcal{A}$ -linear in the second variable such that $\mathcal{M}$ is a Banach space with the norm $\|v\|_{\mathcal{M}} = \|\langle v, v \rangle\|_{\mathcal{A}}^{\frac{1}{2}}$, $\forall v \in \mathcal{M}$. Hilbert C^* -modules first appeared in the work of Kaplansky [3], who used them to prove that derivations of type I AW^* -algebras are inner. Now a good text book about Hilbert C^* -module is [5]. In this paper we mainly consider Hilbert $\mathcal{A}$ -module $H \otimes \mathcal{A}$ (or denoted by $H_{\mathcal{A}}$), where H is a separable infinite dimensional Hilbert space and $\mathcal{A}$ is a unital C^* -algebra. $H_{\mathcal{A}}$ play a special role in the theory of Hilbert C^* -modules (see [5]). Obviously, $H_{\mathcal{A}}$ is countably generated and possesses orthonormal basis $\{e_i \otimes 1\}$, which $\{e_i\}$ is an orthonormal basis in H .

We introduce a class of module maps which is analogues to rank one operators on a Hilbert space. For all $x, y \in H_{\mathcal{A}}$, define $\theta_{x,y} : H_{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{A}}$ by $\theta_{x,y}(\xi) := \langle \xi, y \rangle x$, for every $\xi \in H_{\mathcal{A}}$. Note that $\theta_{x,y}$ is quite different from rank one linear operators on Hilbert space. For instance, we cannot infer $x = 0$ or $y = 0$ from $\theta_{x,y} = 0$. We denote $\{\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \theta_{x_i, y_i}, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ by $\mathcal{F}(H_{\mathcal{A}})$.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 47B49; 46B28.

Key words and phrases. Hilbert C^* -module; coordinate inverse; Additive preservers .

In the present paper, we will describe the additive map $\Phi : \mathcal{F}(H_{\mathcal{A}}) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(H_{\mathcal{A}})$ which maps $\theta_{x,y}$ to some $\theta_{s,t}$. The methods are analogues to those in [2, 4, 9] but much more complicated.

2. DEFINITIONS AND LEMMAS

In this section we mainly introduce some definitions and prove some lemmas.

Definition 1. [8] *Let ε be a orthonormal basis in $H_{\mathcal{A}}$. $x \neq 0$ in $H_{\mathcal{A}}$ will be called coordinatly invertible if for all $e \in \varepsilon$, $\langle e, x \rangle$ is invertible in $\mathcal{A}$ unless $\langle e, x \rangle = 0$.*

We denote the set of all the coordinatly invertible elements in $H_{\mathcal{A}}$ by $CI(H_{\mathcal{A}})$ or CI for short.

Coordinatly invertible elements in Hilbert C^* -module are analogues to elements in linear space to some extents.

Lemma 2. [8] *Supposing $y \in CI$ and $\theta_{x,y} = 0$ then $x = 0$.*

Lemma 3. [8] *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be Hilbert $\mathcal{A}$ -modules, where $\mathcal{A}$ is a unital C^* -algebra, and let $\phi, \sigma : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ be $\mathcal{A}$ -linear operators. Suppose that σ vanishes on the kernel of ϕ . Then there exists a $b \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\sigma = \phi \cdot b$.*

Corollary 4. [8] *Let $g_1, g_2 \in \mathcal{M}$. If for all $x \in \mathcal{M}$, $\langle x, g_1 \rangle = 0$ implying $\langle x, g_2 \rangle = 0$, then there is a $a \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $g_2 = ag_1$.*

The following Lemma 5, which will be used frequently, has been obtained in [8]. Nevertheless we give its proof for the sake of completeness.

Lemma 5. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a unital C^* -algebra, $x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{M}$, $g_1, g_2 \in CI$ satisfying $\theta_{x_1, g_1} + \theta_{x_2, g_2} = \theta_{x_3, g_3}$. Then at least one of the following is true:*

- (i) *there exists a invertible $\alpha_1 \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $g_1 = \alpha_1 g_2$;*
- (ii) *there are $\beta_1, \beta_2 \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $x_1 = \beta_1 x_3$, $x_2 = \beta_2 x_3$.*

Proof. We will complete the proof by considering the following four cases.

Case 1. For all $\xi \in H_{\mathcal{A}}$, $\langle \xi, g_2 \rangle = 0$ implying $\langle \xi, g_1 \rangle = 0$. From Corollary 4, there exists $\alpha_1 \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $g_1 = \alpha_1 g_2$. Furthermore since $g_1, g_2 \in CI$, we infer that $\alpha_1 \in \mathcal{A}$ is invertible.

Case 2. For all $\xi \in H_{\mathcal{A}}$, $\langle \xi, g_1 \rangle = 0$ implying $\langle \xi, g_2 \rangle = 0$. Still from Corollary 4, there is a $\alpha_2 \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $g_2 = \alpha_2 g_1$ and α_2 is invertible.

Case 3. There exists a $\xi_0 \in H_{\mathcal{A}}$ such that $\langle \xi_0, g_2 \rangle = 0$ but $\langle \xi_0, g_1 \rangle \neq 0$. We can find $e \in \varepsilon$ such that $\langle e, g_2 \rangle = 0$ but $\langle e, g_1 \rangle \neq 0$. Then from $\langle e, g_1 \rangle x_1 + \langle e, g_2 \rangle x_2 = \langle e, g_3 \rangle x_3$, it follows $\langle e, g_1 \rangle x_1 = \langle e, g_3 \rangle x_3$. Since $g_1 \in CI$, we have $x_1 = \langle e, g_1 \rangle^{-1} \langle e, g_3 \rangle x_3$. We put $\beta_1 = \langle e, g_1 \rangle^{-1} \langle e, g_3 \rangle$ and get $\theta_{\beta_1 x_3, g_1} + \theta_{x_2, g_2} = \theta_{x_3, g_3}$. Thus $\theta_{x_2, g_2} = \theta_{x_3, g_3 - \beta_1^* g_1}$. Now choosing a $e' \in \varepsilon$, we get $\langle e', g_2 \rangle x_2 = \langle e', g_3 - \beta_1^* g_1 \rangle x_3$ and thus $x_2 = \langle e', g_2 \rangle^{-1} \langle e', g_3 - \beta_1^* g_1 \rangle x_3$. Putting $\beta_2 = \langle e', g_2 \rangle^{-1} \langle e', g_3 - \beta_1^* g_1 \rangle$ then we obtain (ii).

Case 4. There exists $\xi_0 \in H_{\mathcal{A}}$ such that $\langle \xi_0, g_1 \rangle = 0$ but $\langle \xi_0, g_2 \rangle \neq 0$. Similar to Case 3, we get (ii) again. $\square$

Corollary 6. *With the notations in the above lemma, suppose $g_1 \neq \alpha g_2$, for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ and $g_3 \in CI$. Then there exist $\beta_1, \beta_2 \in \mathcal{A}$ which are invertible such that $x_1 = \beta_1 x_3$, $x_2 = \beta_2 x_3$.*

Proof. Denote $\{x|\langle x, g_i \rangle\}$ by $\ker g_i$, $i = 1, 2$. Since $g_1 \neq \alpha g_2$, $g_2 \neq \beta g_1$, we have $\ker g_1 \not\subseteq \ker g_2$, $\ker g_2 \not\subseteq \ker g_1$. So there exists $e_1 \in H_{\mathcal{A}}$, such that $\langle e_1, g_1 \rangle \neq 0$ but $\langle e_1, g_2 \rangle = 0$. Then $\langle e_1, g_1 \rangle x_1 + \langle e_1, g_2 \rangle x_2 = \langle e_1, g_3 \rangle x_3$, i.e. $\langle e_1, g_1 \rangle x_1 = \langle e_1, g_3 \rangle x_3$ and thus $x_1 = \langle e_1, g_1 \rangle^{-1} \langle e_1, g_3 \rangle x_3$. Putting $\langle e_1, g_1 \rangle^{-1} \langle e_1, g_3 \rangle = \beta_1$ is invertible.

Similarly there exists a $e_2 \in H_{\mathcal{A}}$ such that $\langle e_2, g_1 \rangle = 0$ but $\langle e_2, g_2 \rangle \neq 0$. Then $x_2 = \langle e_2, g_2 \rangle^{-1} \langle e_2, g_3 \rangle x_3$. Putting $\beta_2 = \langle e_2, g_2 \rangle^{-1} \langle e_2, g_3 \rangle$. $\square$

Definition 7. $\Phi : \mathcal{F}(H_{\mathcal{A}}) \rightarrow (H_{\mathcal{A}})$ is a map. If for any $x \in H_{\mathcal{A}}$, $y \in CI$, there are $s \in H_{\mathcal{A}}$, $t \in CI$ such that $\Phi(\theta_{x,y}) = \theta_{s,t}$. Then we call Φ is rank one decreasing. If $x \neq 0$ implying $s \neq 0$ then Φ will be called rank one preserving.

Definition 8. $\Phi : \mathcal{F}(H_{\mathcal{A}}) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(H_{\mathcal{A}})$ is an additive map and for arbitrary $\theta_{x,y}$, $\Phi(\lambda \theta_{x,y}) = \tau_{x,y}(\lambda) \Phi(\theta_{x,y})$ where $\tau_{x,y} : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is a map. Then Φ will be called a locally quasi-modular map.

If there exists a $\tau : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is a map such that $\Phi(\lambda T) = \tau(\lambda) \Phi(T)$, for all $T \in \mathcal{F}(H_{\mathcal{A}})$ then Φ will be called a τ -quasi-modular map.

Lemma 9. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a unital commutative C^* -algebra, let A, B be injective τ -quasi-modular continuous maps on $H_{\mathcal{A}}$ with $\dim_{\mathcal{A}}(A(H_{\mathcal{A}})) \geq 2$ and suppose τ is surjective. There is $\lambda_x \in \mathcal{A}$, such that $Bx = \lambda_x Ax$. Then $B = \lambda A$ for some $\lambda \in \mathcal{A}$.

Proof. There are $x_1 \in CI$, $x_2 \in H_{\mathcal{A}}$ such that $\langle Ax_1, Ax_2 \rangle = 0$. From the assumption there exist $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3 \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $Bx_1 = \lambda_1 Ax_1$, $Bx_2 = \lambda_2 Ax_2$ and $B(x_1 + x_2) = \lambda_3 A(x_1 + x_2)$. Therefore, $(\lambda_1 - \lambda_3)Ax_1 + (\lambda_2 - \lambda_3)Ax_2 = 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle (\lambda_1 - \lambda_3)Ax_1 + (\lambda_2 - \lambda_3)Ax_2, (\lambda_1 - \lambda_3)Ax_1 + (\lambda_2 - \lambda_3)Ax_2 \rangle \\ &= (\lambda_1 - \lambda_3) \langle Ax_1, Ax_1 \rangle (\lambda_1 - \lambda_3)^* + (\lambda_2 - \lambda_3) \langle Ax_2, Ax_2 \rangle (\lambda_2 - \lambda_3)^* \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $(\lambda_1 - \lambda_3) \langle Ax_1, Ax_1 \rangle (\lambda_1 - \lambda_3)^* = 0$ and $(\lambda_2 - \lambda_3) \langle Ax_2, Ax_2 \rangle (\lambda_2 - \lambda_3)^* = 0$. Furthermore $(\lambda_1 - \lambda_3)Ax_1 = (\lambda_2 - \lambda_3)Ax_2 = 0$. We infer $Bx_1 = \lambda_1 Ax_1 = \lambda_3 Ax_1$ and $Bx_2 = \lambda_2 Ax_2 = \lambda_3 Ax_2$.

For every $x \in H_{\mathcal{A}}$ such that Ax, Ax_1, Ax_2 is an orthogonal set, we claim that there is a $\lambda \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $Bx = \lambda Ax$. In fact, $Bx = \lambda_x Ax = \lambda_{x+x_1} Ax$ and $Bx_1 = \lambda_1 Ax_1 = \lambda_{x+x_1} Ax_1 = \lambda_3 Ax_1$. It follows that $\lambda_{x+x_1} x_1 = \lambda_3 x_1$ from A is injective. And then $\lambda_{x+x_1} = \lambda_3$. Thus we obtain $Bx = \lambda_3 Ax$.

$A(H_{\mathcal{A}})$ is submodule of $H_{\mathcal{A}}$ since τ is surjective. Let $Ax_1, Ax_2, \dots$ be a orthogonal basis in $A(H_{\mathcal{A}})$. For arbitrary $x \in H_{\mathcal{A}}$, $Ax = \alpha_1 Ax_1 + \alpha_2 Ax_2 + \dots$. Since τ is surjective, there exist $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots$, such that $\alpha_i = \tau(\lambda_i)$, $i = 1, 2, \dots$. Therefore $Ax = A(\lambda_1 x_1 + \lambda_2 x_2 + \dots)$ and $x = \lambda_1 x_1 + \lambda_2 x_2 + \dots$. We infer there exists a $\lambda \in \mathcal{A}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} Bx &= B(\lambda_1 x_1 + \lambda_2 x_2 + \dots) \\ &= \alpha_1 B(x_1) + \alpha_2 B(x_2) + \dots \\ &= \alpha_1 \lambda Ax_1 + \alpha_2 \lambda Ax_2 + \dots \\ &= \lambda A(\lambda_1 x_1 + \lambda_2 x_2 + \dots) \\ &= \lambda Ax \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

Now we introduce some notations. $L_x := \{\theta_{x,g} \mid g \in H_A\}$, $R_f := \{\theta_{x,f} \mid x \in H_A\}$, $L_x^{CI} := \{\theta_{x,g} \mid g \in CI\}$, $R_f^{CI} := \{\theta_{y,f} \mid y \in CI\}$.

The following lemma play important roles in this paper.

Lemma 10. *Let Φ be a additive rank one preserving map. For every $x \in H_A$ there exists either a $y \in H_A$ such that $\Phi(L_x^{CI}) \subseteq L_y^{CI}$ or an $f \in CI$ such that $\Phi(L_x^{CI}) \subseteq R_f$.*

Proof. Assume that there exists a $x_0 \in H_A$ such that $\Phi(L_{x_0}^{CI} \subseteq L_x^{CI}$, $\Phi(L_{x_0}^{CI}) \subseteq R_f$, for all $x \in H_A, f \in CI$. Then there are $f_1, f_2 \in CI$ such that $\Phi(\theta_{x_0,f_1}) = \theta_{x_1,g_1}$, $\Phi(\theta_{x_0,f_2}) = \theta_{x_1,g_2}$, where $x_1 \neq \alpha_1 x$, $x_2 \neq \alpha_2 x$, for all $x \in H_A, \alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathcal{A}$ and $g_1 \neq \beta_1 g_2$, $g_2 \neq \beta_2 g_1$, for all $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{A}$. Since Φ is rank one preserving, $\Phi(\theta_{x_0,f_1+f_2}) = \theta_{x_3,g_3}$ for some $x_3 \in H_A, g_3 \in CI$. On the other hand, from Lemma 5, we get $\theta_{x_1,g_1} + \theta_{x_2,g_2} \neq \theta_{x_3,g_3}$. Thus we reach a contradiction. $\square$

Lemma 11. *At least one of the following is true*

- (1) for all $x \in H_A$, there exists $y \in H_A$ such that $\Phi(L_x^{CI}) \subseteq L_y^{CI}$;
- (2) for all $x \in H_A$, there exists $f \in CI$ such that $\Phi(L_x^{CI}) \subseteq R_f$

Proof. If there are $\dim_{\mathcal{A}} \Phi(L_x^{CI}) = 1$ ($\forall f_1, f_2 \in CI$, $\Phi(\theta_{x,f_1}) = \theta_{y,g_1}$, $\Phi(\theta_{x,f_2}) = \theta_{y,g_2}$ implying $g_1 = \alpha g_2$.) then both (1) and (2) hold.

Now we consider $\dim_{\mathcal{A}} \Phi(L_x^{CI}) \geq 2, \dim_{\mathcal{A}} \Phi(R_f) \geq 2$. Otherwise suppose, to reach a contradiction, that $\Phi(L_{x_0}^{CI}) \subseteq L_{y_0}^{CI}$, $\Phi(L_{x_1}^{CI}) \subseteq R_{g_1}$, where $x_0, x_1 \in H_A, y_0 \in H_A, g_1 \in CI$. Since $\dim_{\mathcal{A}} \Phi(L_{x_0}^{CI}) \geq 2$, there exists a $h \in CI$, such that $\Phi(\theta_{x_0,h}) = \theta_{y_0,g}$, $g \in CI$ with $g \neq \alpha g_1, \forall \alpha \in \mathcal{A}$. Since $\dim_{\mathcal{A}} \Phi(R_f) \geq 2$, we know there exist $k \in H_A$, such that $\Phi(\theta_{x_1,k}) = \theta_{z,g_1}$ with $z \neq \beta x, y_0 \neq \beta x, \forall x \in H_A, \beta \in \mathcal{A}$. Letting $m \in CI$ such that $\Phi(\theta_{x_0,k}) = \theta_{y_0,m}$, then $\Phi(\theta_{x_0+x_1,k}) = \theta_{z,g_1} + \theta_{y_0,m}$. Since $z \neq \alpha x, y_0 \neq \beta x, \forall x \in H_A, \alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{A}$, there exists a $\lambda \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $m = \lambda g_1$ and $\Phi(\theta_{x_0,k}) = \theta_{y_0,m} = \theta_{y_0,\lambda g_1}$. On the other hand, $\Phi(\theta_{x_0,h}) = \theta_{y_0,g}$, $\Phi(\theta_{x_1,h}) = \theta_{l,g_1}$, where $h, g, g_1 \in CI$. From $g_1 \neq \alpha g$, for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\Phi(\theta_{x_0+x_1,h}) = \theta_{y_0,g} + \theta_{l,g_1}$, we infer that there are α_0, β_0 which are invertible such that $y_0 = \alpha_0 y'_0, l = \beta_0 y'_0$. Therefore, $\Phi(\theta_{x_1,g}) = \theta_{\beta_0 y'_0, g_1}$, $\Phi(\theta_{x_0,h}) = \theta_{\alpha_1 y'_0, g}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(\theta_{x_0+x_1,h+k}) &= \Phi(\theta_{x_0,h}) + \Phi(\theta_{x_0,k}) + \Phi(\theta_{x_1,h}) + \Phi(\theta_{x_1,k}) \\ &= \theta_{\alpha_0 y'_0, g} + \theta_{\alpha_0 y'_0, \lambda g_1} + \theta_{\beta_0 y'_0, g_1} + \theta_{z, g_1} \\ &= \theta_{\alpha_0 y'_0, g} + \theta_{(\lambda^* \alpha_0 y'_0 + \beta_0 y'_0 + z), g_1} \end{aligned}$$

Since $g \neq \alpha g_1, z \neq \beta x, y_0 \neq \gamma x$, for all $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \mathcal{A}$, we know $\Phi(\theta_{x_0+x_1,h+k})$ is not rank one which contradicts to the assumption of Φ . $\square$

Corollary 12. *Then one of the following is true*

- (i) for all $f \in H_A$ there exists a $g \in H_A$ with $\Phi(R_f^{CI}) \subseteq R_g^{CI}$;
- (ii) for all $f \in H_A$ there exists $y \in CI$ with $\Phi(R_f^{CI}) \subseteq L_y$

Lemma 13. *Suppose $\text{Im} \Phi$ is neither contained in any L_y or contained in any R_g and $\dim_{\mathcal{A}} \Phi(L_x^{CI}) \geq 2$. Then*

- (i) If for all $x \in H_A$ there exists a $y \in H_A$ such that $\Phi(L_x^{CI}) \subseteq L_y^{CI}$, then $\Phi(R_f^{CI}) \subseteq R_g^{CI}$;
- (ii) If for all $x \in H_A$ there exists a $y \in CI$ such that $\Phi(L_x^{CI}) \subseteq R_y$. Then for all $f \in H_A$ there exists a $z \in CI$ such that $\Phi(R_f^{CI}) \subseteq L_z$.

Proof. We only prove (i). Assume, to reach a contradiction, that we have simultaneously $\Phi(L_x^{CI}) \subseteq L_y^{CI}$ and $\Phi(R_f^{CI}) \subseteq L_z$, for some $z \in CI$. Since $\dim_{\mathcal{A}} \Phi(L_x^{CI}) \geq 2$

there are $k', k'', g', g'' \in CI$ with $g' \neq \alpha g''$ such that $\Phi(\theta_{x,k'}) = \theta_{y,g'}$, $\Phi(\theta_{x,k''}) = \theta_{y,g''}$.

Since $Im\Phi$ is not contained in any L_g , there are $x_1 \in H_A$, $k_1 \in CI$ with $\Phi(\theta_{x_1,k_1}) = \theta_{y_1,g_1}$ such that $y_1 \neq \alpha h$, $y \neq \beta h$, for all $\alpha, \beta \in A$, $h \in H_A$. Consequently $\Phi(L_{x_1}^{CI}) \subseteq L_{y_1}^{CI}$, $\Phi(\theta_{x_1,k'}) = \theta_{y_1,u}$. Therefore, $\Phi(\theta_{x+x_1,k'}) = \theta_{y,g'} + \theta_{y_1,u}$ and then $u = \lambda g'$ for some invertible $\lambda \in A$ i.e. $\Phi(\theta_{x_1,k'}) = \theta_{\lambda^* y_1, g'}$ and $\Phi(R_{k'}^{CI}) \subseteq R_{g'}$. It follows $\Phi(R_{k'}^{CI}) \not\subseteq L_z$ which implying $\Phi(R_f) \subseteq R_g$. So we reach a contradiction. $\square$

Lemma 14. *Suppose $Im\Phi$ is not contained in any L_y nor R_f and $Dim_A \Phi(L_x^{CI}) \geq 2$. If for all $x \in CI$, there exists a $y' \in H_A$ such that $\Phi(L_x^{CI}) \subseteq L_{y'}^{CI}$, then there exists a $y \in CI$ such that $\Phi(L_x^{CI}) \subseteq L_y^{CI}$.*

Proof. It follows from $\Phi(L_x^{CI}) \subseteq L_{y'}^{CI}$ that $\Phi(L_x^{CI}) \not\subseteq R_f$, for all $f \in CI$. If the conclusion of the Lemma were wrong, we will have $\Phi(L_x^{CI}) \not\subseteq L_y^{CI}$, for all $y \in CI$. Thus there exist $g_1 \neq \alpha g_2$, $y_1 \neq \alpha y$, $y_2 \neq \beta y$, $y_1, y_2 \in CI$, for all $y \in CI$ with $\Phi(\theta_{x,f_1}) = \theta_{y_1,g_1}$, $\Phi(\theta_{x,f_2}) = \theta_{y_2,g_2}$. We claim that $y_1 \neq \alpha x$, $y_2 \neq \beta x$, for all $x \in H_A$. If not, there exists a $y'_0 \in H_A$ such that $y_1 \alpha_0 y'_0$, $y_2 = \beta_0 y'_0$. Then it follows that α_0, β_0 are invertible and y'_0 is coordinately invertible which contradicting to $\Phi(L_x^{CI}) \not\subseteq L_y^{CI}$, for all $y \in CI$. So $y_1 \neq \alpha x$, $y_2 \neq \beta x$ but this this contradicting to that $\Phi(\theta_{x,f_1+f_2})$ is rank one. $\square$

Lemma 15. *If $\Phi(L_x^{CI}) \subseteq L_y^{CI}$, then $\Phi(L_x) \subseteq L_y$.*

Proof. For all $f \in H_A$, $f = \sum_i \alpha_i f_i$, $f_i \in CI$, we have $\Phi(\theta_{x,f}) = \Phi(\theta_{x, \sum_i \alpha_i f_i}) = \sum_i \alpha_i^* \Phi(\theta_{x,f_i}) = \sum_i \alpha_i^* \theta_{y,g_i} = \theta_{y, \sum_i g_i}$. Then $\Phi(L_x) \subseteq L_y$. $\square$

Similarly we can prove

Lemma 16. *If $\Phi(L_x^{CI}) \subseteq R_f$, for some $f \in CI$, then $\Phi(L_x) \subseteq R_f$.*

Lemma 17. *For all $x \in CI$, $f \in H_A$, there is a map $\tau_{x,f}$ such that $\Phi(\lambda \theta_{x,f}) = \tau_{x,f}(\lambda) \Phi(\theta_{x,f})$.*

Proof. For all $x \in H_A$, $f \in CI$, $\Phi(\theta_{x,f}) = \theta_{y,g}$, $f, g \in CI$. Therefore $\Phi(\lambda \theta_{x,f}) = \Phi(\theta_{\lambda x, f}) = \theta_{r(\lambda x), g} = \theta_{y, r'(\lambda f)}$ with $g \in CI$. For a $e \in \varepsilon$, $\langle e, g \rangle r(\lambda x) = \langle e, r'(\lambda f) \rangle y$. It follows from $g \in CI$ that $r(\lambda x) = \alpha y$, with $\alpha = \langle e, g \rangle^{-1} \langle e, r'(\lambda f) \rangle$. Denote by $\tau_{x,f}(\lambda) = \alpha$. Then $\Phi(\lambda \theta_{x,f}) = \tau_{x,f} \Phi(\theta_{x,f})$. $\square$

3. MAIN RESULTS

Theorem 18. $\Phi : \mathcal{F}(H_A) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(H_A)$ is a surjective rank one preserving additive map. $Im\Phi$ is neither contained in any L_y nor contained in any R_g . Then one of the following is true: (1) For all $x, f \in H_A$, $\Phi(\theta_{x,f}) = \theta_{Ax, Cf}$ where A, C are injective quasi-modular maps on H_A ;

(2) For all $x, f \in H_A$, $\Phi(\theta_{x,f}) = \theta_{Cf, Ax}$ where A, c are injective conjugate quasi-modular maps on H_A .

Proof. For any $x \in H_A$, there exists a $y \in H_A$ such that $\Phi(L_x) \subseteq L_y$. For all $f \in H_A$ with $\Phi(\theta_{x,f}) = \theta_{y, C_x f}$.

When x in CI, and y can be in CI, we have following claims.

Claim 1. $C_x f$ is a map. In fact, putting $f_1 = f_2$, we have $\Phi(\theta_{x,f_1} = \theta_{y,f_1}, \Phi(\theta_{x,f_2}) = \theta_{y,C_x f_2}$. Since $y \in CI$, we get $C_x f_1 = C_x f_2$.

Claim 2. C_x is injective. Otherwise, there exists a $f_0 \neq 0$ but $C_x f_0 = 0$. So $\Phi(\theta_{x,f_0}) = \theta_{y,C_x f_0} = 0$ contradicting to Φ preserving rank one.

Claim 3. C_x is additive. $\Phi(\theta_{x,f_1+f_2}) = \theta_{y,C_x(f_1+f_2)} = \phi(\theta_{x,f_1}) + \Phi(\theta_{x,f_2}) = \theta_{y,C_x f_1} + \theta_{y,C_x f_2} = \theta_{y,C_x f_1 + C_x f_2}$. It follows that $C_x(f_1 + f_2) = C_x f_1 + C_x f_2$ from $y \in CI$.

Claim 4. C_x is a locally quasi-modular map. From Lemma 17, $\Phi(\lambda\theta_{x,f}) = \tau_{x,f}(\lambda)\Phi(\theta_{x,f}) = \tau_{x,f}(\lambda)\theta_{y,C_x(f)}$, $\Phi(\lambda\theta_{x,f}) = \Phi(\theta_{x,\lambda^*f}) = \theta_{y,C_x(\lambda^*f)}$. So $C_x(\lambda^*f) = \tau_{x,f}(\lambda)^*C_x f$.

Claim 5. $\tau_{x,f}$ is independent of f . In fact there are $f, g \in CI$ with $C_x \perp C_x g$. So $C_x(\lambda f + \lambda g) = \tau_{x,f+g}(\lambda)(C_x f + C_x g) = \tau_{x,f}(\lambda)C_x f + \tau_{x,g}(\lambda)C_x g$, i.e. $[\tau_{x,f+g}(\lambda) - \tau_{x,f}(\lambda)]C_x f - [\tau_{x,f+g}(\lambda) - \tau_{x,g}(\lambda)]C_x g = 0$. It follows that $[\tau_{x,f+g}(\lambda) - \tau_{x,f}(\lambda)]C_x f = 0$ and $[\tau_{x,f+g}(\lambda) - \tau_{x,g}(\lambda)]C_x g = 0$. Therefore $\tau_{x,f} = \tau_{x,g} = \tau_{x,f+g}$.

For all $h \in CI$, $C_x h \perp C_x f$, $C_x h \perp C_x g$, we have $\tau_{x,h} = \tau_{x,f+g}$. $\tau_{x,h}$ is multiplicative. In fact, $\Phi(\lambda_1 \lambda_2 \theta_{x,h}) = \tau_{x,h}(\lambda_1)\Phi(\lambda_2 \theta_{x,h}) = \tau_{x,h}(\lambda_1)\tau_{x,h}(\lambda_2)\Phi(\theta_{x,h})$. And since $\Phi(\theta_{x,h}) = \theta_{y,C_x(h)}$, $y, C_x(h) \in CI$, we have $\tau_{x,h}(\lambda_1 \lambda_2) = \tau_{x,h}(\lambda_1)\tau_{x,h}(\lambda_2)$.

For all $f = \sum_i \alpha_i f_i$, $f_i \in CI$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(\lambda\theta_{x,f}) &= \Phi(\lambda\theta_{x,\sum_i \alpha_i f_i}) = \Phi(\lambda \sum_i \alpha_i^* \theta_{x,f_i}) \\ &= \sum_i \Phi(\lambda \alpha_i^* \theta_{x,f_i}) = \sum_i \tau_{x,f+g}(\lambda \alpha_i^*) \Phi(\theta_{x,f_i}) \\ &= \sum_i \tau_{x,f+g}(\lambda) \tau_{x,f+g}(\alpha_i^*) \Phi(\theta_{x,f_i}) \\ &= \tau_{x,f+g}(\lambda) \Phi(\theta_{x,f}) \end{aligned}$$

We infer $\tau_{x,f}(\lambda) = \tau_x(\lambda)$.

Claim 6. τ_x is a injective homomorphism from $\mathcal{A}$ to $\mathcal{A}$. For all $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathcal{A}$, $\Phi((\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)\theta_{x,f}) = \tau_x(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)\theta_{y,C_x f} = (\tau_x(\lambda_1) + \tau_x(\lambda_2))\theta_{y,C_x f}$ and therefore $C_x[\tau_x(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)^*f - (\tau_x(\lambda_1) + \tau_x(\lambda_2))^*f] = 0$. Since C_x is injective, we get $\tau_x(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)^*f = [\tau_x(\lambda_1)^* + \tau_x(\lambda_2)^*]f$. When putting $f \in CI$ we have $\tau_x(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2) = \tau_x(\lambda_1) + \tau_x(\lambda_2)$.

From the above Claim we know τ_x is multiplicative.

If τ_x is not injective, then there exists a $0 \neq \lambda_0 \in \mathcal{A}$ but $\tau_x(\lambda_0) = 0$. So $\Phi(\lambda_0 \theta_{x,f}) = \tau_{x,f}(\lambda_0)\theta_{y,C_x f} = 0$ which contradicting to Φ rank one preserving.

Claim 7. τ_x is independent of x .

Let $x_1, x_2 \in CI$ with $\Phi(L_{x_1}^{CI}) \subseteq L_{y_1}^{CI}$, $\Phi(L_{x_2}^{CI}) \subseteq L_{y_2}^{CI}$ and $\langle y_1, y_2 \rangle$, $y_1, y_2 \in CI$.

For arbitrary $\lambda \in \mathcal{A}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(\lambda\theta_{x_1,f}) &= \tau_{x_1}(\lambda)\Phi(\theta_{x_1,f}) = \tau_{x_1}(\lambda)\theta_{y_1,C_{x_1}f} \\ \Phi(\lambda\theta_{x_2,f}) &= \tau_{x_2}(\lambda)\Phi(\theta_{x_2,f}) = \tau_{x_2}(\lambda)\theta_{y_2,C_{x_2}f} \end{aligned}$$

and so

$$(1) \quad \Phi(\lambda\theta_{x_1+x_2,f}) = \tau_{x_1}(\lambda)\theta_{y_1,C_{x_1}f} + \tau_{x_2}(\lambda)\theta_{y_2,C_{x_2}f} = \tau_{x_1+x_2}(\lambda)\theta_{y_3,C_{x_1+x_2}f}$$

When $\lambda = 1$,

$$(2) \quad \theta_{y_1,C_{x_1}f} + \theta_{y_2,C_{x_2}f} = \theta_{y_3,C_{x_1+x_2}f}$$

Since $\langle y_1, y_2 \rangle = 0$, $y_1, y_2 \in CI$, $y_1 \neq \alpha y, y_2 \neq \beta y$, for all $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{A}, y \in H_{\mathcal{A}}$. by Corollary 6, there exists a invertible $\sigma \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $C_{x_1}f = \sigma C_{x_2}f$.

Similarly, it follows $C_{x_1}g = \nu C_{x_2}g$ from $\Phi(\lambda\theta_{x_1,g}) = \tau_{x_1}(\lambda)\theta_{y_1,C_{x_1}g}$, $\Phi(\lambda\theta_{x_2,g}) = \tau_{x_2}(\lambda)\theta_{y_2,C_{x_2}g}$ and putting $\lambda = 1$.

Now consider the rank one map $\theta_{x_1+x_2,\lambda f+\lambda g}$ mapped by Φ :

$$\begin{aligned} & \Phi(\theta_{x_1+x_2,\lambda f+\lambda g}) \\ &= \tau_{x_1}(\lambda)\theta_{y_1,C_{x_1}f} + \tau_{x_1}(\lambda)\theta_{y_1,C_{x_1}g} + \tau_{x_2}(\lambda)\theta_{y_2,C_{x_2}f} + \tau_{x_2}(\lambda)\theta_{y_2,C_{x_2}g} \\ &= \tau_{x_1}(\lambda)\sigma\theta_{y_1,C_{x_2}f} + \tau_{x_1}(\lambda)\nu\theta_{y_1,C_{x_2}g} + \tau_{x_2}(\lambda)\theta_{y_2,C_{x_2}f} + \tau_{x_2}(\lambda)\theta_{y_2,C_{x_2}g} \\ &= \theta_{\tau_{x_1}(\lambda)\sigma y_1 + \tau_{x_2}(\lambda)y_2, C_{x_2}f} + \theta_{\tau_{x_1}(\lambda)\nu y_1 + \tau_{x_2}(\lambda)y_2, C_{x_2}g} \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by Φ preserving rank one, we know there exist $y_3, h(\lambda) \in H_{\mathcal{A}}$ such that $\Phi(\theta_{x_1+x_2,\lambda f+\lambda g}) = \theta_{y_3,h(\lambda)}$. From Corollary again, there exist $\alpha(\lambda), \beta(\lambda) \in \mathcal{A}$ such that

$$(3) \quad \begin{cases} \tau_{x_1}(\lambda)\sigma y_1 + \tau_{x_2}(\lambda)y_2 = \alpha(\lambda)y_3 \\ \tau_{x_1}(\lambda)\nu y_1 + \tau_{x_2}(\lambda)y_2 = \beta(\lambda)y_3 \end{cases}$$

So

$$(4) \quad \begin{cases} \beta\tau_{x_1}(\lambda)\sigma y_1 + \beta\tau_{x_2}(\lambda)y_2 = \alpha(\lambda)\beta(\lambda)y_3 \\ \alpha(\lambda)\tau_{x_1}(\lambda)\nu y_1 + \alpha(\lambda)\tau_{x_2}(\lambda)y_2 = \alpha(\lambda)\beta(\lambda)y_3 \end{cases}$$

We infer

$$(5) \quad (\beta(\lambda)\tau_{x_1}(\lambda)\sigma - \alpha(\lambda)\tau_{x_1}(\lambda)\nu)y_1 + (\beta(\lambda)\tau_{x_2}(\lambda) - \alpha(\lambda)\tau_{x_2}(\lambda))y_2 = 0$$

Since $\langle y_1, y_2 \rangle = 0$ and $y_1, y_2 \in CI$, we get

$$(6) \quad \begin{cases} \beta(\lambda)\tau_{x_1}(\lambda)\sigma = \alpha(\lambda)\tau_{x_1}(\lambda)\nu \\ \beta(\lambda)\tau_{x_2}(\lambda) - \alpha(\lambda)\tau_{x_2}(\lambda) = 0 \end{cases}$$

and we get $\beta(1) = \alpha(1)$, $\sigma = \nu$.

Thus

$$C_{x_1}(\lambda f) = \tau_{x_1}(\lambda)C_{x_1}f = \tau_{x_1}(\lambda)\sigma C_{x_2}f$$

$$C_{x_1}(\lambda f) = \sigma C_{x_2}(\lambda f) = \sigma\tau_{x_2}(\lambda)C_{x_2}f$$

and so

$$\tau_{x_1}(\lambda)\sigma C_{x_2}f = \sigma\tau_{x_2}(\lambda)C_{x_2}f$$

which implying

$$\tau_{x_1}(\lambda) = \tau_{x_2}(\lambda) := \tau(\lambda).$$

For every $x \in CI$, $\Phi(L_x^{CI}) \subseteq L_y^{CI}$, for some $y \in CI$. Then $y = \sum_i \beta_i y_i$, where $\{y_i\} \subseteq CI$ is a orthogonal set. $\Phi(\theta_{x,f}) = \theta_{y,C_x f} = \sum_i \beta_i \theta_{y_i, C_x f}$.

Since Φ is surjective, there are $\{x_i\}$ with $\Phi(L_{x_i}^{CI}) \subseteq L_{y_i}^{CI}$. For all $0 \neq f \in CI$, $\Phi(\theta_{x_i,f} + \theta_{x_0,f}) = \theta_{y_i, C_{x_i}f} + \theta_{y_0, C_{x_0}f}$ is rank one, so that $C_{x_i}f = \gamma_i C_{x_0}f$ for some

invertible $\gamma_i \in \mathcal{A}$. There are $\alpha_i \in \mathcal{A}$ with $\tau_{x_i}(\alpha_i) = \beta_i$, $\tau_{x_i}(\delta_i) = \gamma_i^{-1}$. We consider

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Phi(\theta_{\sum_i \delta_i \alpha_i x_i, f}) \\
&= \sum_i \Phi(\theta_{\delta_i \alpha_i x_i, f}) \\
&= \sum_i \tau_{x_i}(\delta_i \alpha_i) \Phi(\theta_{x_i, f}) \\
&= \sum_i \gamma_i^{-1} \beta_i \theta_{y_i, C_{x_i} f} \\
&= \sum_i \gamma_i^{-1} \beta_i \theta_{y_i, \gamma_i C_x f} \\
&= \sum_i \beta_i \theta_{y_i, C_x f}
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\Phi(\theta_{x, f}) = \Phi(\theta_{\sum_i \delta_i \alpha_i x_i, f})$. Since Φ preserving rank one and $0 \neq f \in CI$, we get $x = \sum_i \delta_i \alpha_i x_i$.

For all $\lambda \in \mathcal{A}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Phi(\lambda \theta_{x, f}) = \Phi(\lambda \theta_{\sum_i \delta_i \alpha_i x_i, f}) \\
&= \sum_i \Phi(\lambda \delta_i \alpha_i \theta_{x_i, f}) \\
&= \sum_i \tau_{x_i}(\lambda \delta_i \alpha_i) \Phi(\theta_{x_i, f}) \\
&= \sum_i \tau(\lambda) \tau(\delta_i \alpha_i) \Phi(\theta_{x_i, f}) \\
&= \sum_i \tau(\lambda) \Phi(\theta_{\delta_i \alpha_i x_i, f}) \\
&= \sum_i \tau(\lambda) \Phi(\theta_{\sum_i \delta_i \alpha_i x_i, f}) \\
&= \tau(\lambda) \Phi(\theta_{x, f})
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we infer that τ_x is independent of x .

Claim 8. C_x is independent of $x \in CI$. For $x_1, x_2 \in CI$ with $\Phi(L_{x_1}^{CI}) \subseteq L_{y_1}^{CI}$, $\Phi(L_{x_2}^{CI}) \subseteq L_{y_2}^{CI}$, where $y_1, y_2 \in CI$, $y_1 \neq \alpha y$, $y_2 \neq \beta y$ for all $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{A}, y \in H_{\mathcal{A}}$. Then we have

$$\Phi(\theta_{x_1+x_2, f}) = \theta_{y_1, C_{x_1} f} + \theta_{y_2, C_{x_2} f}$$

This yields $C_{x_1} f = \alpha_f C_{x_2} f$, for all $f \in H_{\mathcal{A}}$. From Lemma 9, we know there exists a $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $C_{x_1} = \alpha C_{x_2}$, $C_{x_2} = \beta C_{x_1}$.

For arbitrary $x \in CI$ with $\Phi(L_x^{CI}) \subseteq L_y^{CI}$, $y \in CI$ assume there exist $\alpha_0, \beta_0, \alpha_1, \beta_1 \in \mathcal{A}$, $y_0, y'_0 \in H_{\mathcal{A}}$ such that $y = \alpha_0 y_0$, $y_1 = \beta_0 y_0$; $y = \alpha_1 y'_0$, $y_2 = \beta_1 y'_0$. We infer that $\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \beta_0, \beta_1 \in \mathcal{A}$ are invertible from $y, y_1, y_2 \in CI$. Then we get $y_1 = \gamma_1 y_0$, $y_2 = \gamma_2 y_0$ for some $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \mathcal{A}$ which contradicting to the properties of y_1, y_2 . Thus we have shown that either $y \neq \alpha y'$, $y_1 \neq \beta y'$ or $y \neq \alpha y'$, $y_2 \neq \beta y'$ for all $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{A}, y' \in H_{\mathcal{A}}$. Consequently, C_x and C_{x_1} differ only by a multiplicative $\alpha_x \in \mathcal{A}$. By absorbing this α_x in the first term of θ , C_x becomes independent of x .

Denoting $\alpha_x y$ by $A'x$, we get

$$(7) \quad \Phi(\theta_{x,f}) = \theta_{y,C_x f} = \theta_{\alpha_x y, Cf} = \theta_{A'x, Cf}.$$

Now for all $x \in H_{\mathcal{A}}$ (may not in CI), $x = \sum_i \alpha_i x_i$, where $x_i \in CI$, with $\Phi(\theta_{x_i, f}) = \theta_{Ax_i, Cf}$. Then we have

$$(8) \quad \Phi(\theta_{x,f}) = \Phi(\theta_{\sum_i \alpha_i x_i, f}) = \sum_i \tau(\alpha_i) \Phi(\theta_{x_i, f}) = \sum_i \tau(\alpha_i) \theta_{A'x_i, Cf} = \theta_{\sum_i \tau(\alpha_i) A'x_i, Cf}$$

We denote $\sum_i \tau(\alpha_i) A'x_i$ by Ax . Then for all $x, f \in H_{\mathcal{A}}$ we always have

$$(9) \quad \Phi(\theta_{x,f}) = \theta_{Ax, Cf}$$

When $f \in CI$, it is easy to show A is a injective quasi-modular map. And since Ax is independent of f we know that A is always a injective quasi-modular map.

Statement (2) can be shown similarly, and we can get our desired results. $\square$

REFERENCES

1. G.An, J.Hou, Rank-preserving multiplicative maps on $B(X)$, Lin. Alg. Appl. 342 (2002) 59-78
2. J.Hou, Rank preserving linear maps on $B(X)$, Sci. in China (ser. A), 32 (1989), 929-940
3. I.Kaplansky, Modules over operator algebras, Amer. J. Math. 75 (1953) 839-853
4. B.Kuzma, Additive mappings decreasing rank one, Lin. Alg. Appl. 348 (2002) 175-187
5. C.Lance, Hilbert C^* -modules: a toolkit for operator algebraists, London Math. Soc. Lecture Notes Series, vol. 210, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1994
6. B.Meng, M.Guo, X.Cao, Operator-valued free Fisher information and modular frame, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., vol 133, no. 10, 3087-3096
7. B.Meng, M.Guo, X.Cao, Some applications of free Fisher information on frame theory, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 311 (2005) 466-478
8. B.Meng, Rank-preserving module maps, Preprint
9. M.Omladic, P.Semrl, Additive mappings preserving operators of rank one, Lin. Alg. Appl., 182 (1993) 239-256

COLLEGE OF SCIENCE, NANJING UNIVERSITY OF AERONAUTICS AND ASTRONAUTICS, NANJING 210016, PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA
E-mail address: **b.meng@nuaa.edu.cn**